

REMARKS

In summary, claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 7, 12, 15, 19, 21, 26, and 29 are independent. Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 2 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 5-8, 10, 11, 14, 19-22, 24, 25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 9 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 21, 26, 27, 29 and 30 have been amended without reciting new matter. Support for the clarification may be found, for example, in paragraph 0067 of the Published Application (2005/0091486) pertaining to the second execution environment maintaining shadow GUI elements corresponding to secure execution environment GUI elements.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 26 and 27, including independent claims 1, 12, 15, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435, issued to Boebert *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,501, issued to Gulick *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Gulick”). (Office Action, pp. 2-8). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that Boebert modified by Gulick fails to teach the claimed subject matter. Previous remarks about the lack of teaching of Boebert remain valid and are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety as if fully set forth herein.

Briefly, regarding previously presented claims, for reasons set forth in greater detail in incorporated remarks, it would not have been obvious to modify Boebert with Gulick because (a) Boebert teaches away from combining its add-on system to its workstation to create a single computer system and (b) combining the add-on system with the workstation would modify Boebert’s principle of operation of a separate add-on system and (c) combining the add-on

system with the workstation would render Boebert's system unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of avoiding risks by having software on the same system.¹ Given Boebert's video feed output selector 38 switching between the output of two different systems and keyboard input switch 37 switching input between two different systems, it simply is not obvious to modify those two systems into two execution environments on one computer. See, e.g., Boebert, col. 5, ll. 36-39 ("Since window 82 is created outside of workstation 40, by trusted elements, it is not possible for malicious software in workstation 40 to control any of the video in trusted window 82."

Regarding presently presented claims, it is respectfully submitted that the similar amendment (pertaining to the second execution environment maintaining shadow GUI elements for secure execution environment GUI elements) to all independent claims renders the present rejection moot.

Claims 13 and 27, original and as amended, add more detailed limitations to the present amendment by specifying the second execution environment comprises a host window manager that creates the shadow GUI elements.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 13 and 27 is clearly without merit. In paragraph 10, page 6, the Office Action cites Boebert, column 5, lines 33-43, column 7, lines 20-25 and column 8, lines 45-50 as allegedly teaching that Boebert's workstation 40 creates shadow GUI elements for GUI elements created by add-on system 30. This is clearly inaccurate because workstation 40 doesn't even know add-on system 30 exists. They don't interact. The

¹ The proposed modification of Boebert runs afoul of prohibitions against rendering Boebert system unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, changing its principle of operation and combining it with references in a way that is taught away from by Boebert. These prohibitions are bright line tests proving that alleged modifications are, in fact, not obvious. Any "proposed modification can not render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose" (M.P.E.P. § 2143.01.V). Further, "[t]he proposed modification cannot change the principle of operation of a reference." (M.P.E.P. § 2143.01.VI). Further still, "[i]t is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination." M.P.E.P. § 2145 X.D.2. Each "prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed subject matter." M.P.E.P. § 2141.02 VI. "A reference may be said to teach away when a person of ordinary skill, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by the applicant." In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir., 1994).

Office Action cites video feed selector 38 as the host manager claimed in claims 13 and 27, but there is no accurate comparison to be made since all that video feed selector 38 does is switch the display's 10 video feed between workstation 40 and add-on system 30.

It is also clear from the cited quotes that Boebert fails to even remotely disclose anything like what is claimed in all independent claims. See, e.g., Boebert, col. 5, ll. 36-39 ("Since window 82 is created outside of workstation 40, by trusted elements, it is not possible for malicious software in workstation 40 to control any of the video in trusted window 82."); col. 7, ll. 24-26 ("The system essentially provides a pipe to keep data from one security level from being mixed into data at a different security level."); col. 8, lines 45-50 ("Video data from workstation 40 is transmitted from video port 44 to video manager 34. During normal mode, the video data is sent through to display 10 without modification. During trusted path mode, however, the video data transferred from video port 44 is overlaid, at least in some part, by video data generated by video manager 34."). None of these portions of Boebert cited by the Office Action discloses anything relevant to the subject matter in claims 13 and 27 or the present amendment to all independent claims.

Thus, the claimed subject matter as previously and presently presented is clearly patentable over the cited references. The foregoing remarks apply equally well to all pending claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejection of Claims 2, 5-11, 14, 16, 19-25 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Gulick and further in view of US Patent No. 6,512,529, issued to Janssen *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "Janssen"), claims 5-8, 10, 11, 14, 19-22, 24, 25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Gulick and further in view of an article by Ye, "Trusted paths for browsers: An open-source solution to web spoofing," Feb 4, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as "Ye") and claims 9 and 23 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Gulick and further in view of Ye and an article by Dhamija, "Hash Visualization in User Authentication," April, 2000 (hereinafter referred to as "Dhamija"). (Office Action, pp. 8-17). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

All of the foregoing remarks apply equally well to each of these rejections because all independent claims previously shared and presently share the limitations addressed in the foregoing remarks. Present amendments render the present rejection moot because it fails to address the claims as they are presently amended and because a citation against the nearest subject matter lacks merit. The additional references Janssen, Ye and Dhamija are not cited to, and they fail to, teach or suggest the subject matter that Applicants pointed out in the previous section that Boebert and Gulick fail to teach or suggest. Thus, all pending claims are allowable for at least the same reasons provided in the previous section.

Additionally, the citation to Ye against independent claims 5 and 19 is clearly without merit. Claims 5 and 19 require display of a secret. Ye does not display a secret. Ye relies on a random generator. The only secret in Ye is the random generator. However, Ye doesn't display the random generator. Instead, Ye only displays the pattern produced by the random generator.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2, 5-11, 14, 16, 19-25 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

DOCKET NO.: 305955.01 [MSFT-2816]
Application No.: 10/691,759
Office Action Dated: April 14, 2010

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Date: July 14, 2010

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439